



To skellehe@blm.gov

cc

bcc

05/06/2011 09:16 PM

Subject pilot joe scoping comments

I am concerned with new roads being built. I do not want more roads in our public forests. There are plenty. I believe the project can move forward using existing roaded areas. I am concerned with the pollution from erosion from road building and road use. Roads allow ohv easy access into new areas. Roads create opportunities for other land owners to access parcels that were not easily accessible potentially allowing for clear cutting their land, mining, and poaching ect. Roads invite invasive species and environmental pollution. Decommissioning already built roads sounds like it will not work because it will cost too much making the sale less likely and the public less supportive at the same time. It also seems complicated with other land owners having reciprocation rights to roads. This seems like it could take time to work out. I am concerned that this collaborative process is focusing only on the china keeler sale. I understand that nepa was already done there. The project is rushed. It is dependent on aprior sale (china keeler). It seems like working out the details that will be good for the community as well as the blm/timber industry challenging. I am concerned that the fuels reduction will not be part of the initial sale. I do not want to see yarding happening through the skips. It seems that Dr.s Franklin and Johnson did not intend for yarding to happen this way. I am concerned that as soon as it is inconvenient to collaborate with the public it will stop happening. I am concerned for the old growth trees in the proposed landing site. I thought old growth was off the table. I agree that there seems to be a lack of 'experts' on how to log in new and innovative ways in Southern Oregon. I understand there are people in the Eugene area that have actual experience on the ground with what we are trying to do here. If what we are trying to accomplish is a sustainable harvest using new and innovative methods that will provide habitat for all the animals and a diversity of trees and plants in the forest the BLM needs to push the bar and try some of these new innovative techniques.

Norm and Jerry have been speaking of this all along..they say that the BLM needs to throw out their old tools and use new ones. I also believe we need to work with the tools we have available for example.. It makes no sense to me that analyzing the data for the landing would not be a priority. It is my understanding that the "Agency personnel have run a "profile" of the slope but have not yet analyzed the data and determined feasibility, although it was stated that the current landing site was "the best location for logging". It seems "payloads" will be the deciding factor" This quote from the ID team disturbs me. The BLM has the equipment knowledge and man power to do such a simple thing as determine the feasibility of the landing. Doing so could possibility save some old growth trees. Isn't this crucial to keeping the trust of the community? T y opinions in the spirit of collaboration. [REDACTED]